Global Games with Noisy Information Sharing

Hessam Mahdavifar, Ahmad Beirami, Behrouz Touri, and Jeff S. Shamma

arXiv:1510.08204v1 [cs.SI] 28 Oct 2015

***Abstract*— Global games form a subclass of games with incomplete information where a set of agents decide actions against a regime with an underlying fundamental θ representing its power. Each agent has access to an independent noisy observation of θ. In order to capture the behavior of agents in a social network of information exchange we assume that agents share their observation in a noisy environment prior to making their decision. We show that global games with noisy sharing of information do not admit an intuitive type of threshold policies which only depends on agents' belief about the underlying θ. This is in contrast to the existing results on the threshold policies for the conventional set-up of global games. Motivated by this result, we investigate the existence of equilibrium strategies in a more general collection of threshold-type policies and show that such equilibrium strategies exist and are unique if the sharing of information happens over a sufficiently noisy environment.**

I. INTRODUCTION

Games of incomplete information are central to modeling of socio-economic behaviors in social networks. In games with incomplete information, the information that is shared among the agents is not symmetric and often each agent has access to limited information about the game's parameters, which may be correlated with the information that is available to the other agents. This incompleteness of information is often represented by considering the payoff as a function of some random variable whose exact value is not known to the agents, which is called the underlying economic or political fundamental in the society.

A subclass of games with incomplete information is the class of global games, originally introduced in [1], [2]. In its simplest form, each agent has access to an independent observation of the underlying fundamental based on which she takes either of the two actions: risky or safe action. The payoff of an agent taking the risky action is monotonically increasing with the number of agents who take the risky action and is a decreasing function of the underlying fundamental. Global games have been used to model and study many social coordination phenomena including bank runs, currency crises, and political uprisings (see [3] and the references therein).

The majority of the past studies on global games have been focused on the information structure where each agent has an independent noisy observation of the underlying economic or social fundamental, i.e., given the fundamental, the observations of each agent is independent of the rest of the agents' observations. In such settings, it has been shown that, under some condition on the distribution of the underlying fundamental and the independency of agents' observations, there exists an equilibrium strategy with threshold policies based on the private observations of each agent. In [4], the case of perfect sharing of information was introduced and the structure of equilibria for global games with perfect sharing of information was discussed.

In this paper, global games with noisy sharing of information are introduced where any two agents share their information in a noisy environment. Our contributions are summarized below:

- We show that with noisy information sharing an intuitive type of threshold policies which only depends on agents' belief about the underlying θ does not lead to a Bayesian Nash equilibrium.
- We show that if a certain functional equation has a solution, then a symmetric Bayesian Nash equilibrium exists for global games with noisy sharing of information which can be described as a general form of threshold policies.
- We utilize Banach fixed point theorem and show that the functional equation has a solution if the noise and the information structure of the underlying model satisfy certain conditions. This establishes the existence of equilibrium threshold strategies when the noise parameters and the information structure satisfy certain conditions.

It is worth noting that this work also relates to many of the recent attempts for understanding the role of information and information structure in multiagent decision making problems [5]–[8]. The structure of this paper is as follows. In Section II we formally introduce global games with noisy sharing of information, and we mathematically formulate the problem of interest. In Section III we formally state the three main theorems of the paper on the non-existence of certain intuitive threshold policies, the existence of a general form of threshold policies and the convergence to this threshold policy via an iterative method. In Section IV the proofs of the three main theorems are established. Some numerical examples are provided in Section V. Finally, we conclude the paper in Section VI.

II. PROBLEM SETUP

In this section, we present the framework of the problem that will be studied in this paper. We study the basic form of the global games with noisy sharing of information. In this setting, we consider a set

$$[n] := \{1, \dots, n\},$$

of n agents or players and each agent has a set of binary actions $A_i = \{0, 1\}$. We refer to the action $\alpha_i = 1$ as the risky action and $\alpha_i = 0$ as the safe action. The payoff of an agent taking

The work of J. S. Shamma was supported by AFOSR/MURI Projects No. FA9550-09-1-0538 and No. FA9550-10-1-0573.

H. Mahdavifar is with the Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering, University of California San Diego, USA (email: hessam@ucsd.edu).

A. Beirami is with the Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering, Duke University, USA, and also with the Research Laboratory of Electronics, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, USA (email: ahmad.beirami@duke.edu, beirami@mit.edu).

B. Touri is with the Department of Electrical, Computer, and Energy Engineering, University of Colorado Boulder, USA (email: behrouz.touri@colorado.edu).

J. S. Shamma is with the School of Electrical and Computer Engineering, Georgia Institute of Technology, USA, and also with the CEMSE Division, King Abdullah University of Science and Technology, Saudi Arabia (email: shamma@gatech.edu, jeff.shamma@kaust.edu.sa).

the safe action is zero whereas that of taking the risky action is $\sum_{i=1}^{n} \alpha_i - \theta$ where θ is a random variable representing the underlying fundamental in the society. In other words, if $\alpha = (\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_n) \in \{0,1\}^n$ is an action profile of the n agents, then the utility of the ith agent is the function u_i with

$$u_i(\alpha) = \alpha_i(\sum_{j=1}^{n} \alpha_j - \theta). \tag{1}$$

The major challenge in analyzing global games with noisy sharing of information is the limited information of each agent about the underlying fundamental θ. Note that if all the agents know about the exact realization of θ, and for $\theta \neq n$ either of the symmetric actions $(0, \ldots, 0)$ or $(1, \ldots, 1)$ would be appealing. However, in the global games, the perfect knowledge of the underlying fundamental is not available to any agent and each agent has a noisy observation of the fundamental θ.

Observations and Policies: In the standard setting for global games, agent i is observing $x_i = \theta + \eta_i$ where η_i's are identically and independently distributed random variables [1], [2]. In our work, our focus would be the study of global games where each agent shares its own observation x_i with the other agents in the society through a noisy channel. Mathematically, we represent agent i's observation by a random vector $y_i \in \mathbb{R}^{d_i}$ (which relates to θ and other agents' observations). We refer to y_i as the (private) information of agent i (about θ). We refer to a measurable function $s_i : \mathbb{R}^{d_i} \to A_i$ that maps a private observation of agent i to one of the two actions as a (pure) *strategy* or *policy*. When $d_i = 1$ for some i, we say that s_i is a threshold policy if $s_i(y) = 1$ for $y \leqslant t$ and $s_i(y) = 0$ for $y > t$, for some threshold value t. We denote such a strategy by $s_i(y) = 1_{y \leqslant t}$. In almost all the instances of the global games, the random variables have continuous joint distribution and hence, the value of the strategy s_i at the threshold value t is practically unimportant.

Equilibrium: Our focus in this paper is on the existence of a strategy profile $s = (s_1, \ldots, s_n)$ that results in a Bayesian Nash Equilibrium. To introduce this, let $s = (s_1, \ldots, s_n)$ be a strategy profile of the n agents and let $s^{-i} = (s_1, \ldots, s_{i-1}, s_{i+1}, \ldots, s_n)$ be the strategy profile of the $n-1$ agents except the ith agent's strategy. We say that a *best response strategy* to the strategy profile s^{-i} is a strategy $\tilde{s} : \mathbb{R}^{d_i} \to A_i$ such that

$$\tilde{s}(u) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } 1 + E[\sum_{j \neq i} s_j(y_j) \mid y_i = u] < E[\theta \mid y_i = u], \\ 1 & \text{if } 1 + E[\sum_{j \neq i} s_j(y_j) \mid y_i = u] > E[\theta \mid y_i = u]. \end{cases} \tag{2}$$

We denote the set of all best responses to a strategy profile s^{-i} by $BR_i(s^{-i})$. Finally, we say that a strategy profile $s = (s_1, \ldots, s_n)$ is a *Bayesian Nash Equilibrium* or simply an *equilibrium* if $s_i \in BR(s^{-i})$ for all $i \in [n]$.

An extensively studied model in global games is the case where $d_i = 1$ for all $i \in [n]$ and $y_i = x_i = \theta + \xi_i$ where $\{\xi_1, \ldots, \xi_n\}$ are *independent* and identically distributed $\mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2)$ Gaussian random variables for some $\sigma^2 > 0$. Furthermore, it is customary to assume that θ is picked from a non-informative uniform distribution over $\mathbb{R}$. See [3] and the references therein for further discussion on this assumption.

In [3], it is shown that there exists a symmetric threshold policy on x_i's which corresponds to a Bayesian Nash equilibrium for this instance of global games. In other words, there exists a threshold value $t \in \mathbb{R}$ such that for $x_i \leqslant t$, agent i chooses to take the risky action and for $x_i > t$, she takes the safe action and such an action profile leads to an equilibrium. Here, an important fact is that $x_i = E[\theta \mid x_i]$ which means that in such an equilibrium each agent should compare her *expected strength of regime given her private observation* to a threshold and take a proper action accordingly.

Our Model for Information Structure: In this work, we consider global games with noisy sharing of information. We try to understand the role of information sharing among the agents in the decision making scenarios that are modeled by global games. For example, what is the structure of an equilibria in bank run where information is being shared between the agents?

Throughout this work the utility of each agent is given by (1) and the information structure satisfies the following assumption.

Assumption 1 *We assume that θ is uniformly distributed over $\mathbb{R}$. Also, agent i's private information is the n dimensional random vector:*

$$y_i := (x_i, \{y_{ji}\}_{j \in [n] \setminus \{i\}}), \tag{3}$$

where $x_i = \theta + \xi_i$ for all $i \in [m]$ and $y_{ji} = x_j + \zeta_{ji}$ for $j \neq i$, where $\xi_1, \ldots, \xi_n$ are i.i.d. $\mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2)$ random variables and ζ_{ji} are i.i.d. $\mathcal{N}(0, \tau^2)$ random variables that are independent of $\xi_1, \ldots, \xi_n$ and $\sigma^2, \tau^2 > 0$ are given parameters.

The dependence diagram of the random observation vector $y_i = (x_i, \{y_{ji}\}_{j \in [n] \setminus \{i\}})$ that is available to agent i is shown in Figure **1**.

Throughout the rest of the paper, the scalar $\sum_{j \in [n] \setminus \{i\}} y_{ji}$ which is the sum of all the information arrived at agent i from the rest of agents plays a central role. We denote this quantity by z_i, i.e.,

$$z_i := \sum_{j \in [n] \setminus \{i\}} y_{ji}. \tag{4}$$

We define a global game with noisy sharing of information as below.

Definition1 *We refer to a game with utility functions $u_1, \ldots, u_n$ described by* (1) *and information structure satisfying Assumption* 1 *as a global game with noisy information sharing.*

III. MAIN RESULTS

In this section, we present the main results of this work including two results: a result on nonexistence of an *intuitive* equilibrium for global games with noisy sharing of information. The second result shows that under a certain regime, there exists a threshold policy based on each agent's private information and the (noisy) information that is shared with her by the other agents.



Figure 1. The dependence diagram between the observation vector $y_i = (x_i, \{y_{ji}\}_{j\in[n]\setminus\{i\}})$ of agent i. In this diagram, $\chi \xrightarrow{\sigma^2} \psi$ implies that $\psi = \chi + \omega$, where χ and ω are independent and $\omega \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2)$.

A. Nonexistence of an Intuitive Equilibrium

In many instances of the global games, one can show that there exists a threshold policy based on the expected value of the underlying fundamental given each agent's information. More precisely, let

$$\bar{\theta}_i(y_i) = E[\theta \mid y_i].$$

Then, it is shown that if there is no sharing of information (i.e. $y_i = x_i$) and θ is a uniformly distributed over $\mathbb{R}$ or θ has a Gaussian prior, then there exists a threshold value t such that the policy $(1_{\bar{\theta}_1(y_1)\leqslant t}, \ldots, 1_{\bar{\theta}_n(y_n)\leqslant t})$ is a Bayesian Nash Equilibrium for the global games described above [9].

In the case of global games with noisy sharing of information, one may hope to have a similar result, i.e., there exists a threshold value t such that if everyone compares her expected value of the fundamental variable θ given her own information, the policy $(1_{\bar{\theta}_1(y_1)\leqslant t}, \ldots, 1_{\bar{\theta}_n(y_n)\leqslant t})$ would be a Bayesian Nash Equilibrium. For example, in the case of bank run, one may speculate that if each agent compares her expected strength of the economy given her own information, she should decide whether to take her money out of the bank or not and this behavior would result in an equilibrium. However, the following result shows that such an *intuitive* equilibrium for global games with noisy sharing of information does not exist.

Theorem 1. *Consider the global game with noisy sharing of information as described in Definition* 1*. Then, there does not exist threshold values $t_1, \ldots, t_n$ such that the $(1_{\bar{\theta}_1(y_1)\leqslant t}, \ldots, 1_{\bar{\theta}_n(y_n)\leqslant t})$ is an equilibrium.*

B. Existence of a Threshold Policy Equilibrium

In light of Theorem 1, one may pose the question as how one can extend the existence of threshold policies for conditionally independent signals to the case of interdependent private signals. Here, we show that indeed we can extend such an existence result to the case of global games with sharing of information.

Before presenting this result, the notion of threshold policies is extended from the case of a scalar private information to multi-dimension information vector. Consider the information available to agent i, i.e., $y_i = (x_i, \{y_{ji}\}_{j\in[n]\setminus\{i\}})$. For a function $h : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}$, we will be focusing on the symmetric threshold strategies $1_{h(y_i)\geqslant 0}$. A strategy is called symmetric if it does not depend on the index of the agents. Namely, in this case, the function h is the same for all the agents. We will further limit our attention to the class of functions $h : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}$ which are continuous and strictly decreasing with respect to any of the n input parameters, while the other input parameters are fixed. A symmetry condition on h is also required which will be clarified later in this section.

With this, the main existence results of this paper are stated in the next two theorems.

Theorem 2. *Let $h : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}$ be a continuous and componentwise strictly decreasing function. Then h leads to a threshold policy equilibrium if it is the solution to a certain functional equation characterized by the noise variance parameters of the system.*

Theorem 3. *For any given n, there exists an unbounded set of parameters $\Theta \subset \mathbb{R}^{+2}$ such that for any $(\sigma^2, \tau^2) \in \Theta$ there exists a symmetric Bayesian Nash Equilibrium $(1_{h(y_1)\geqslant 0}, \ldots, 1_{h(y_n)\geqslant 0})$ for some continuous and componentwise decreasing function $h : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}$. Furthermore, h can be approximated with an arbitrary precision (in L_∞ norm).*

The proof of Theorem 3 will be based on defining a contraction mapping on the space of feasible strategy functions h and then utilizing Banach fixed point theorem to establish the existence of h that solves the functional equation of Theorem 2. Consequently, it is shown that an iterative method of applying the contraction mapping will result in the convergence to the desired h which can be used as an approximation method to find h with arbitrary precision.

We will also characterize a sufficient condition on the noise parameters (σ^2, τ^2) to be contained in the set Θ of Theorem 3. In particular, it is shown that for a fixed ratio of $r = \frac{\tau}{\sigma}$, $(\sigma^2, r^2\sigma^2) \in \Theta$, for large enough σ. This implies that the set Θ is unbounded in any direction. Roughly speaking, for a sufficiently noisy environment there exists a threshold type Bayesian Nash Equilibrium.

One may conjecture that Theorem 3 should hold for the whole set of noise parameters and it should be independent from the noise parameters, i.e., $\Theta = \mathbb{R}^{+2}$. However, we indeed conjecture that such a symmetric equilibrium does not exist for arbitrary $\sigma^2, \tau^2 > 0$.

The above three theorems suggest that in the settings that global games are relevant (such as bank run, or political uprising), one should not be oblivious to the information structure details and the information shared between the people and just rely on the estimate of the underlying fundamental θ.

IV. PROOFS

In this section, we provide the proof of the main results discussed in Section III. The following calculations for the statistics of conditional Gaussian random vectors are central to the proof of the main results.

The first lemma derives the probability distribution of θ conditioned on the observation vector y_i of the ith agent.

Lemma 4. *Suppose that Assumption* 1 *holds. Let η_n^2 be a scalar such that*

$$\frac{1}{\eta_n^2} = \frac{1}{\sigma^2} + \frac{n-1}{\sigma^2+\tau^2}.$$

Further, let $a_n := \frac{\eta_n^2}{\sigma^2}$ *and* $b_n := \frac{\eta_n^2}{\sigma^2+\tau^2}$. *Then, conditioned on agent* i*'s observation* y_i, θ *is given by*

$$\theta = a_n x_i + b_n z_i + \varepsilon_\theta,$$

where ε_θ *is a* $\mathcal{N}(0, \eta_n^2)$ *Gaussian random variable independent of* y_i.

Proof. Note that $(x_i, \{y_{ji}\}_{j\in[n]\setminus\{i\}})$ are zero-mean independent Gaussian observations of θ. Therefore, the result follows by invoking Lemma 11 from the appendix. ∎

To investigate the existence of a threshold policy for agent i, we further need to derive the distribution of agent k's observation vector y_k given agent i's observation y_i. In a sense, this is agent i's perception of what is available to agent k.

Lemma 5. *Let Assumption* 1 *hold. Further, let*

$$\frac{1}{\gamma_n^2} = \frac{1}{\tau^2} + \frac{1}{\eta_{n-1}^2 + \sigma^2},$$

and define $c_n := \frac{\gamma_n^2}{\eta_{n-1}^2+\sigma^2}$ *and* $d_n := \frac{\gamma_n^2}{\tau^2}$. *Then, conditioned on* y_i, *we can write* $y_k = (x_k, \{y_{lk}\}_{l\in[n]\setminus\{k\}})$ *as jointly Gaussian random variables defined by:*

$$x_k = \overline{x_k} + \varepsilon_k, \;\; y_{ik} = x_i + \varepsilon_{ik}, \;\; y_{lk} = \overline{y_{lk}} + \varepsilon_{lk},$$

where[1]

$$\begin{cases} \overline{x_k} = c_n a_{n-1} x_i + d_n y_{ki} + c_n b_{n-1} \sum_{j\in[n]\setminus\{i,k\}} y_{ji}, \\ \overline{y_{lk}} = c_n a_{n-1} x_i + d_n y_{li} + c_n b_{n-1} \sum_{j\in[n]\setminus\{i,l\}} y_{ji}, \end{cases} \tag{5}$$

and $(\varepsilon_k, \{\varepsilon_{lk}\}_{l\in[n]\setminus\{k\}})$ *are jointly Gaussian random variables independent of* $(x_i, \{y_{ji}\}_{j\in[n]\setminus\{i\}})$, *and* ε_k *is* $\mathcal{N}(0, \gamma_n^2)$; *and* ε_{ik} *is* $\mathcal{N}(0, \tau^2)$ *independent of* $\epsilon := (\varepsilon_k, \{\varepsilon_{lk}\}_{l\in[n]\setminus\{i,k\}})$.

Proof. Since θ follows a non-informative uniform prior on $\mathbb{R}$, x_k (or y_{jk}) also follows a uniform prior on $\mathbb{R}$. Therefore, $(x_i, \{y_{ji}\}_{j\in[n]\setminus\{i\}})$ can be viewed as zero-mean independent Gaussian observations of x_k (or y_{jk}). Hence, by invoking Lemma 11 we arrive at the desired results. Furthermore, it is clear that, conditioned on x_i, y_{ik} is independent of all other $\{x_j\}_{j\in[n]\setminus\{i\}}$ and $\{y_{jk}\}_{j\in[n]\setminus\{i\}}$. Hence, ε_{ik} is independent of $(\varepsilon_k, \{\varepsilon_{lk}\}_{l\in[n]\setminus\{i,k\}})$ as desired. ∎

A. Proof of Theorem 1

Suppose that $(1_{a_n x_i + b_n z_i \leqslant t_1}, \ldots, 1_{a_n x_n + b_n z_n \leqslant t_n})$ is an equilibrium for some $t_1, \ldots, t_n \in \mathbb{R}$. Let $\beta_n, \gamma_n, \delta_n$ be defined as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \beta_n &:= b_n + a_n c_n a_{n-1} + (n-2) b_n c_n a_{n-1} \\ \gamma_n &:= a_n d_n + (n-2) b_n c_n b_{n-1} \\ \delta_n &:= a_n c_n b_{n-1} + b_n d_n + (n-3) b_n c_n b_{n-1} \end{aligned}$$

Then let $V = [v_{ij}]_{n\times n}$ be a matrix with the following entries:

$$v_{ij} = \begin{cases} a_n, \text{ if } i = 1, j = 1, \\ b_n, \text{ if } i = 1, 1 < j \leqslant n, \\ \beta_n, \text{ if } 1 < i \leqslant n, j = 1, \\ \gamma_n, \text{ if } 1 < i = j \leqslant n, \\ \delta_n, \text{ if } 1 < i \neq j \leqslant n, \end{cases} .$$

[1]Note that $\overline{x_k}$ and $\overline{y_{lk}}$ are functions of the observation vector y_i of agent i but the dependence is left implicit for brevity.

In other words, V has the following structure:

$$V = \begin{pmatrix} a_n & b_n & b_n & \ldots & b_n \\ \beta_n & \gamma_n & \delta_n & \ldots & \delta_n \\ \beta_n & \delta_n & \gamma_n & \ldots & \delta_n \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \beta_n & \delta_n & \delta_n & \ldots & \gamma_n \end{pmatrix}.$$

By Lemma 4 and Lemma 5, we have

$$\big(\bar\theta_i(y_i), \big\{\mathsf{E}\big[\bar\theta_j(y_j) \mid y_i\big]\big\}_{j\neq i}\big) = V y_i^T \tag{6}$$

It is assumed that $\tau > 0$, i.e., information sharing between agents is noisy and not perfect. This leads to $a_n > b_n$ and consequently $\gamma_n > \delta_n$. We next show that this implies that V is non-singular. By subtracting the first column of V scaled by δ_n/β_n from all other columns we get

$$V' = \begin{pmatrix} a_n & b_n - \frac{\delta_n}{\beta_n} a_n & b_n - \frac{\delta_n}{\beta_n} a_n & \ldots & b_n - \frac{\delta_n}{\beta_n} a_n \\ \beta_n & \gamma_n - \delta_n & 0 & \ldots & 0 \\ \beta_n & 0 & \gamma_n - \delta_n & \ldots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \beta_n & 0 & 0 & \ldots & \gamma_n - \delta_n \end{pmatrix}.$$

It can be observed that $b_n - \delta_n a_n/\beta_n < 0$ and hence, by subtracting the first row scaled by $\frac{\beta_n}{a_n}$ from the other rows, V' is made lower triangular with strictly positive diagonal elements. Therefore, V' and consequently V are non-singular.

Using the fact that V is non-singular together with (6) one can find $y_i \in \mathbb{R}^n$ such that $\bar\theta_i(y_i) = a_n x_i + b_n z_i = t_i - \epsilon$, for an arbitrary $\epsilon > 0$, and $\mathsf{E}\big[\bar\theta_j(y_j) \mid y_i\big] > M$, for $j \neq i$, for any arbitrarily large number $M \in \mathbb{R}^+$. Note that the variance of $\bar\theta_j(y_j)$ given y_i is a constant function of σ^2 and τ^2 (by Lemma 5). Therefore, using Chebyshev's inequality, for the given threshold values $t_1, \ldots, t_n$, one can find $y_i \in \mathbb{R}^n$ such that $\bar\theta_i(y_i) = t_i - \epsilon$ and

$$P(\bar\theta_j(y_j) \leqslant t_j \mid y_i) \leqslant \epsilon.$$

But by the structure of an equilibrium (2), we should have

$$\begin{aligned} (n-1)\epsilon + 1 &\geqslant \sum_{j\neq i} P(\bar\theta_j(y_j) \leqslant t_j \mid y_i) + 1 \\ &\geqslant \bar\theta_i(y_i) = t_i - \epsilon. \end{aligned}$$

Since the above inequality must hold for any $\epsilon > 0$, we have $t_i \leqslant 1$.

On the other hand, using the same argument for any $\epsilon > 0$, one can find y_i such that $\bar\theta_i(y_i) = t_i + \epsilon$ and $\mathsf{E}\big[\bar\theta_j(y_j) \mid y_i\big] < -M$, for $j \neq i$, for any arbitrarily large number $M \in \mathbb{R}^+$. Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} t_i + \epsilon &\geqslant \bar\theta_i(y_i) \\ &> E(\sum_{j\neq i} 1_{\bar\theta_j(y_j)\leqslant t_j} \mid y_i) + 1 \\ &\geqslant 1 + (1-\epsilon)(n-1) = n - (n-1)\epsilon. \end{aligned}$$

Since, this holds for any $\epsilon > 0$, it follows that $t_i \geqslant n$ which contradicts $t_i \leqslant 1$. Therefore, such a threshold equilibrium does not exist.

The above proof can be extended to a more general case of

utility functions that are monotone with respect to the actions of the players and also are continuous functions of the underlying fundamental θ.

B. *Proof of Theorem* 2

We start by introducing the set of threshold policies that we will be focusing on. Consider the information available to agent i, i.e., $y_i = (x_i, \{y_{ji}\}_{j\in[n]\setminus\{i\}})$. For a function $h : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}$, we will be focusing on the threshold strategies $1_{h(y_i)\geqslant 0}$. We will further limit our attention to the class of functions $h : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}$ which are continuous and strictly decreasing with respect to any of the n input parameters, while the other input parameters are fixed. Monotone strategies are natural candidates to consider because if taking risky action is not appealing for a given observation, it is natural to consider strategies that assign the safe action to any larger observation. A symmetry condition on h is also required which will be clarified later in this section.

The goal is to show there exists, under some conditions on noise parameters σ^2, τ^2, a function $h : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}$ with the above conditions, such that the strategy profile $s = (1_{h(y_1)\geqslant 0}, \ldots, 1_{h(y_n)\geqslant 0})$ is an equilibrium for the global games with noisy sharing of information, where $s_i = 1_{h(y_i)\geqslant 0}$ is the threshold policy that prescribes:

$$\begin{cases} \alpha_i = 1 \text{ if } h(y_i) \geqslant 0 \\ \alpha_i = 0 \text{ if } h(y_i) < 0 \end{cases} \tag{7}$$

for agent i. We refer to such a function h as a *threshold function* and we refer to the resulting symmetric strategy profile

$$s = (1_{h(y_1)\geqslant 0}, \ldots, 1_{h(y_n)\geqslant 0}) \tag{8}$$

as a symmetric threshold policy. If the strategy profile given in (8) is an equilibrium for the underlying game, we say that the threshold function h leads to a (symmetric) threshold policy equilibrium.

By the definition of a (Bayesian Nash) equilibrium, the function h leads to a threshold policy equilibrium if a best response of any agent $i \in [n]$ is characterized by the threshold policy described in (7). In other words, we have

$$\begin{aligned} 1 + \sum_{k\in[n]\setminus\{i\}} P\Big(h(y_k) \geqslant 0 \mid y_i\Big) &\geqslant E(\theta \mid y_i) \\ &= a_n x_i + b_n z_i \end{aligned} \tag{9}$$

if and only if $h(y_i) \geqslant 0$, for any $i \in [n]$, where z_i is given in (4).

Remark. It is shown in Theorem 1 that an equilibrium with a threshold policy on $E(\theta|y_i)$ does not exist. In light of the definition of threshold functions provided here, this result can be stated as the threshold function $h(x, y) = a_n x + b_n y + c$, where $c \in \mathbb{R}$ is a constant, does not lead to a threshold policy equilibrium. We emphasize that our definition of a threshold function only considers a symmetric threshold policy (if it exists), where all agents take actions according to the same threshold function h.

Consider a continuous threshold function h which leads to a Bayesian Nash equilibrium. It can be observed that if $h(y_i) = 0$, then (9) also turns into equality. In other words, we have

$$a_n x_i + b_n z_i = 1 + \sum_{k\in[n]\setminus\{i\}} P\Big(h(y_k) \geqslant 0 | y_i\Big). \tag{10}$$

Note that given the parameters of the system, the right hand side of (10) can be regarded as an operation on the function h. The definition of this operation will be provided later in this section. This motivates us to define a *fixed point threshold* function as follows:

Definition 2. *We say that $h : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}$ is a fixed point threshold function if for any choice of $y_i = (x_i, \{y_{ji}\}_{j\in[n]\setminus\{i\}})$, we have $h(y_i) = 0$ if and only if (10) also holds.*

We note here that a fixed point threshold function $h(\cdot)$ is not necessarily unique. In fact, the set of transition points $\{r \mid h(r) = 0\}$ plays a central role in defining the strategy profile as in (8), rather than h itself. Any other strictly decreasing function g that has the same set of transition points defines the same strategy profile as h does.

For notational convenience, we let

$$y_{i\setminus k} := (x_i, \{y_{ji}\}_{j\in[n]\setminus\{i,k\}})$$

for $i, k \in [n]$. Note that if $h : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}$ is a continuous fixed point threshold function, then for any $k \in [n] \setminus \{i\}$ and $y_{i\setminus k}$, there exists $y_{ki} \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $h(y_i) = 0$, where y_i is defined in (3). The reason is that the right hand side of (10) is bounded between 1 and n, while the left hand side of (10) is unbounded in terms of $y_{ki} \in \mathbb{R}$, while $(x_i, \{y_{ji}\}_{j\in[n]\setminus\{i,k\}})$ is fixed. Therefore, there exists $y_{ki} \in \mathbb{R}$ such that (10) turns into equality and since h is a fixed point threshold function, by definition, $h(y_i) = 0$. We let $\mathcal{I}h(x_i, \{y_{ji}\}_{j\in[n]\setminus\{i,k\}})$ to denote the solution y_{ki} for $h(y_i) = 0$. Furthermore, if h is strictly decreasing with respect to any of its input parameters, $\mathcal{I}h(x_i, \{y_{ji}\}_{j\in[n]\setminus\{i,k\}})$ is unique. In fact, $\mathcal{I}h : \mathbb{R}^{n-1} \to \mathbb{R}$ is also a strictly decreasing function.

As mentioned before, the function h is not unique, however, $\mathcal{I}h$ is unique under some additional conditions. Therefore, instead of explicit characterization of h, we will be solving the fixed point equation for $\mathcal{I}h$ and then, we pick h as follows:

$$h(y_i) := \mathcal{I}h(y_{i\setminus k}) - y_{ki} \tag{11}$$

As discussed earlier, a symmetry condition on h with respect to $\{y_{ji}\}_{j\in[n]\setminus\{i\}}$ is naturally needed in order to have a symmetric threshold policy equilibrium. In fact all the other agents look the same to the agent i and the observations $\{y_{ji}\}_{j\in[n]\setminus\{i\}}$ follow the same model, as illustrated in Figure **1**, hence the indexing of other agents should not matter. The symmetry condition can be that $h(y_i)$ is the same if $\{y_{ji}\}_{j\in[n]\setminus\{i\}}$ is permuted. However, this is too general for our purpose and h as constructed in (11) may not satisfy this condition. In fact the symmetry condition only matters when $h(y) = 0$, because the threshold policy will be uniquely determined given the set of solutions for $h(y) = 0$ when h is strictly decreasing. The symmetry condition is then defined as follows:

Definition 3. *We say that $h : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}$ is a symmetric threshold function if for any root $y = (x_i, \{y_{ji}\}_{j\in[n]\setminus\{i\}})$ of h, y with a permuted $\{y_{ji}\}_{j\in[n]\setminus\{i\}}$ is also a root of h.*

Note that if h is strictly decreasing and symmetric fixed point function, the function $\mathcal{I}h : \mathbb{R}^{n-1} \to \mathbb{R}$ does not depend on the choice of index k.

The following theorem is the main result of this section and presents a sufficient condition on h to be a threshold function.

Theorem 6. *Let $h : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}$ be strictly decreasing and symmetric fixed point threshold function according to Definition 2. Then h leads to a threshold policy equilibrium.*

Proof. For $i \in [n]$, let $y_i = (x_i, \{y_{ji}\}_{j\in[n]\setminus\{i\}})$ denote the observations of agent i. We fix i and consider two different cases:
Case 1: $h(y_i) \geqslant 0$.
Note that $\mathcal{I}h : \mathbb{R}^{n-1} \to \mathbb{R}$ is a strictly decreasing function and $h(y_k) \geqslant 0$ if and only if $y_{ik} \leqslant \mathcal{I}h(x_k, \{y_{lk}\}_{l\in[n]\setminus\{i,k\}})$. Using Lemma 5 we have

$$\begin{aligned} &P\Big(h(y_k) \geqslant 0 \mid y_i\Big) \\ &= P\Big(y_{ik} \leqslant \mathcal{I}h(y_{k\setminus i}) \mid y_i\Big), \\ &= P\Big(x_i + \varepsilon_{ik} \leqslant \mathcal{I}h(\overline{x_k} + \varepsilon_k, \{\overline{y_{lk}} + \varepsilon_{lk}\}_{l\in[n]\setminus\{i,k\}})\Big), \end{aligned} \tag{12}$$

where $\overline{x_k}$ and $\overline{y_{lk}}$ are the means of x_k and y_{lk} conditioned on y_i, respectively, and are derived in (5). Let $\epsilon = \big(\varepsilon_k, \{\varepsilon_{lk}\}_{l\in[n]\setminus\{i,k\}}\big)$ and $f_\epsilon(\epsilon)$ denote the joint probability density function (PDF) of the Gaussian random variables $(\varepsilon_k, \{\varepsilon_{lk}\}_{l\in[n]\setminus\{i,k\}})$. By Lemma 5, ε_{ik} is independent of ϵ and thus, (12) can be rewritten as in (13), shown on top of the next page.

In (13), φ is the cumulative distribution function (CDF) of the normal distribution with unit variance. For $j \in [n] \setminus \{i\}$, let $y'_{ji} \geqslant y_{ji}$ such that $h(y'_i) = 0$, where $y'_i = (x_i, \{y'_{ji}\}_{j\in[n]\setminus\{i\}})$. Let also $\overline{x_k}'$ and $\overline{y_{lk}}'$ be defined with respect to x_i and y'_{ji} as in Lemma 5. Then by following the same arguments and by noting that $y_{ik} = x_i + \varepsilon_{ik}$ does not change while changing y_{ji} to y'_{ji}, (14) follows, where $y'_i = (x_i, \{y'_{ji}\}_{j\in[n]\setminus\{i\}})$. Observe that $\overline{x_k} \leqslant \overline{x_k}'$ and $\overline{y_{lk}} \leqslant \overline{y_{lk}}'$. Also, note that $\mathcal{I}h$ is a decreasing function and φ is an increasing function. Therefore, (13) together with (14) imply that

$$P\Big(h(y_k) \geqslant 0 \mid y_i\Big) \geqslant P\Big(h(y_k) \geqslant 0 \mid y'_i\Big). \tag{15}$$

By summing (15) over all $k \in [n] \setminus \{i\}$ and using the fixed point property of h at $(x_i, \{y'_{ji}\}_{j\in[n]\setminus\{i\}})$ as described in Definition 2, we get

$$\begin{aligned} 1 + &\sum_{k\in[n]\setminus\{i\}} P\Big(h(y_k) \geqslant 0 \mid y_i\Big) \\ &\geqslant 1 + \sum_{k\in[n]\setminus\{i\}} P\Big(h(y_k) \geqslant 0 \mid y'_i\Big) \\ &= a_n x_i + b_n \sum_{j\in[n]\setminus\{i\}} y'_{ji} \geqslant a_n x_i + b_n z_i \\ &= E(\theta \mid y_i). \end{aligned} \tag{16}$$

Therefore, the best response of agent i is to take the risky action.
Case 2: $h(y_i) < 0$.
In this case we take $y'_{ji} < y_{ji}$ such that $h(y'_i) = 0$. The inequalities in (15) and (16) will be reversed and the best response of agent i is to take the safe action. This will complete the proof. ∎

C. Proof of Theorem 3

In this section, we analyze the convergence of an iterative scheme for finding the threshold function and consequently the threshold policy equilibrium. Sufficient conditions to guarantee the convergence are established and then Theorem 2 is utilized to complete the proof of Theorem 3.

The goal is to find $\mathcal{I}h$ such that the threshold function h, as derived in (11), satisfies the conditions of Theorem 6. By replacing y_{ki} with $\mathcal{I}h(y_{i\setminus k})$ in (10) and using derivation of $P\Big(h(y_k) \geqslant 0 \mid y_i\Big)$ in (13), (10) can be turned into a fixed point equation for the function $\mathcal{I}h$. Let

$$g(y_{i\setminus k}) := a_n x_i + b_n \mathcal{I}h(y_{i\setminus k}) + b_n \sum_{j\in[n]\setminus\{k,i\}} y_{ji}. \tag{17}$$

Note that $g(y_{i\setminus k})$ is simply the left-hand side of (10). We finally arrive at the definition for the fixed point function $g : \mathbb{R}^{n-1} \to \mathbb{R}$ as follows.

Definition 4. *We call $g : \mathbb{R}^{n-1} \to \mathbb{R}$ with the input $y \in \mathbb{R}^{n-1}$ to be a fixed point function if*

$$g(y) = 1 + \sum_{l\in[n]\setminus\{i\}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{n-1}} \varphi\left(\mathcal{M}_{\epsilon,l} g(y)\right) f_\epsilon(\epsilon) d\epsilon, \tag{18}$$

where $f_\epsilon(\epsilon)$ denote the joint probability density function (PDF) of the Gaussian random variables $(\varepsilon_l, \{\varepsilon_{jl}\}_{j\in[n]\setminus\{i,l\}})$ and

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{M}_{\epsilon,l} g(y) = \frac{1}{b_n \tau}\big(&g(\overline{x_l} + \varepsilon_l, \{\overline{y_{jl}} + \varepsilon_{jl}\}_{j\in[n]\setminus\{i,l\}}) \\ &- a_n(\overline{x_l} + \varepsilon_l) - b_n \sum_{j\in[n]\setminus\{i,l\}} (\overline{y_{jl}} + \varepsilon_{jl}) - b_n x_i\big), \end{aligned} \tag{19}$$

where $\overline{x_l}$ and $\overline{y_{jl}}$ are the means of x_l and y_{jl} derived in (5) in terms of $y_{i\setminus k} = y$ and

$$y_{ki} = \frac{1}{b_n} g(y_{i\setminus k}) - \frac{a_n}{b_n} x_i - \sum_{j\in[n]\setminus\{k,i\}} y_{ji}.$$

Definition 5. *We define the operator $\mathcal{T}$ to be the operator that maps a sufficiently well-behaved function $g : \mathbb{R}^{n-1} \to \mathbb{R}$ to $\mathcal{T}g : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ defined by*

$$\mathcal{T}g(y) := 1 + \sum_{l\in[n]\setminus\{i\}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{n-1}} \varphi(\mathcal{M}_{\epsilon,l} g(y)) f_\epsilon(\epsilon) d\epsilon, \tag{20}$$

where $\mathcal{M}_{\epsilon,l}$ is defined in (19).

If g is a fixed point function, according to Definition 4, then $\mathcal{T}g = g$, by definition of $\mathcal{T}g$ in (20). Therefore, finding a fixed point function g is equivalent to finding a fixed point for the operator $\mathcal{T}$.

In the subsequent discussion, we will derive conditions that will characterize the term *sufficiently well-behaved* in the above statement. First we notice that $\mathcal{T}$ can be viewed as a mapping that maps the space of measurable functions $g : \mathbb{R}^{n-1} \to [1, n]$

$$P\Big(h(y_k)\geqslant 0 \mid y_i\Big)=\int_{\mathbb{R}^{n-1}}\varphi\big(\frac{1}{\tau}(\mathcal{I}h(\overline{x_k}+\varepsilon_k,\{\overline{y_{lk}}+\varepsilon_{lk}\}_{l\in[n]\setminus\{i,k\}})-x_i)\big)f_\epsilon(\epsilon)d\epsilon \tag{13}$$

$$P\Big(h(y_k)\geqslant 0 \mid y'_i\Big)=\int_{\mathbb{R}^{n-1}}\varphi\big(\frac{1}{\tau}(\mathcal{I}h(\overline{x'_k}+\varepsilon_k,\{\overline{y'_{lk}}+\varepsilon_{lk}\}_{l\in[n]\setminus\{i,k\}})-x_i)\big)f_\epsilon(\epsilon)d\epsilon, \tag{14}$$

to itself. This follows from the fact that $\varphi(\alpha)\in[0,1]$ for all $\alpha\in\mathbb{R}$.

To find a fixed point for the operator $\mathcal{T}$, the structure of the fixed point equation (20) suggests the investigation of the iteration

$$g^{(t+1)}=\mathcal{T}g^{(t)}, \tag{21}$$

for some *sufficiently well-behaved* initial function $g^{(0)}$. Indeed, we will prove that $\mathcal{T}$ induces a contraction mapping on the space $C_0(\mathbb{R}^{n-1},[1,n])$ and hence, converges to a unique fixed point. Throughout our discussion, $C_0(\mathbb{R}^{n-1},[1,n])$ is the space of continuous functions from $\mathbb{R}^{n-1}$ to $[1,n]$ embedded with the uniform norm:

$$\|g_1-g_2\|:=\sup_{y\in\mathbb{R}^{n-1}}|g_1(y)-g_2(y)|.$$

Once the fixed point function g is found, $\mathcal{I}h$ is derived from g according to (17) and then h is derived from $\mathcal{I}h$ as in (11). However, we will need h to be symmetric according to Definition 3. If a function $g:\mathbb{R}^{n-1}\to\mathbb{R}$ leads to a symmetric $h:\mathbb{R}^n\to\mathbb{R}$ through the mentioned transformations, then g is called a *quasi-symmetric* function. Note that if g is quasi-symmetric, then $\mathcal{T}g$ is also quasi-symmetric. Because the definition of $\mathcal{T}$ suggests that it is independent of the labeling of indices $l\in[n]\setminus\{i\}$ and also there is a symmetry between $\mathcal{I}h(y_{i\setminus k})$ and y_{ji}, for $j\in[n]\setminus\{k,i\}$ in (17). Therefore, we limit our attention to the set of quasi-symmetric functions.

Moreover, in order to make sure that g leads to a strictly decreasing $\mathcal{I}h$ and consequently a threshold function h, we impose a stronger condition on g. The Lipschitz continuity is imposed on $g:\mathbb{R}^{n-1}\to\mathbb{R}$, where $\mathbb{R}^{n-1}$ is embedded with the L_1 norm. We show that the Lipschitz continuity with parameter a_n is preserved through $\mathcal{T}$ under certain conditions, i.e., we require that for any $y_{i\setminus k},y'_{i\setminus k}\in\mathbb{R}^{n-1}$:

$$|g(y_{i\setminus k})-g(y'_{i\setminus k})|\leqslant a_n|x_i-x'_i|+a_n\sum_{j\in[n]\setminus\{k,i\}}|y_{ji}-y'_{ji}|, \tag{22}$$

Let $\mathcal{F}$ denote the space of all Lipschitz continuous functions f with parameter a_n which are also quasi-symmetric. We aim at characterizing a condition on the noise variance parameters of the system such that the Lipschitz continuity is preserved through the operation $\mathcal{T}$. In other words $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{F})\subseteq\mathcal{F}$, where $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{F})=\{\mathcal{T}(g):g\in\mathcal{F}\}$.

The following lemma establishes a sufficient condition on the parameters of the system to preserve the Lipschitz continuity through the operation $\mathcal{T}$. Let

$$e_n:=\max\{c_na_{n-1},d_n,c_nb_{n-1}\}. \tag{23}$$

Lemma 7. *If*

$$\frac{(n-1)\big(e_n(na_n+(n-2)b_n)(b_n+2a_n)+b_n^2\big)}{a_nb_n^2}\leqslant\tau, \tag{24}$$

then Lipschitz continuity with parameter a_n is preserved through the operation $\mathcal{T}$.

Proof. Let $y,y'\in\mathbb{R}^{n-1}$. Then by definition of operation $\mathcal{T}$,

$$\begin{aligned}&\mathcal{T}g(y)-\mathcal{T}g(y')\\&=\sum_{l\in[n]\setminus\{i\}}\int_{\mathbb{R}^{n-1}}\big(\varphi(\mathcal{M}_{\epsilon,l}g(y))-\varphi(\mathcal{M}_{\epsilon,l}g(y'))\big)f_\epsilon(\epsilon)d\epsilon.\end{aligned} \tag{25}$$

Observe that $|\varphi(A)-\varphi(B)|\leqslant|A-B|$ for any $A,B\in\mathbb{R}$. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}&|\mathcal{T}g(y)-\mathcal{T}g(y')|\\&\leqslant\sum_{l\in[n]\setminus\{i\}}\int_{\mathbb{R}^{n-1}}|\varphi(\mathcal{M}_{\epsilon,l}g(y))-\varphi(\mathcal{M}_{\epsilon,l}g(y'))|f_\epsilon(\epsilon)d\epsilon\\&\leqslant\sum_{l\in[n]\setminus\{i\}}\int_{\mathbb{R}^{n-1}}|\mathcal{M}_{\epsilon,l}g(y)-\mathcal{M}_{\epsilon,l}g(y')|f_\epsilon(\epsilon)d\epsilon.\end{aligned} \tag{26}$$

Let $\delta=\|y-y'\|_1$. In the following series of inequalities, we only use the Lipschitz continuity of g as given in (22) and triangle inequality. For any $l\in[n]\setminus\{i\}$ and $\epsilon\in\mathbb{R}^{n-1}$,

$$\begin{aligned}&b_n\tau\big|\mathcal{M}_{\epsilon,l}g(y)-\mathcal{M}_{\epsilon,l}g(y')\big|\\&\leqslant|g(\overline{x_l}+\varepsilon_l,\{\overline{y_{jl}}+\varepsilon_{jl}\}_{j\in[n]\setminus\{i,l\}})\\&-g(\overline{x_l}'+\varepsilon_l,\{\overline{y_{jl}}'+\varepsilon_{jl}\}_{j\in[n]\setminus\{i,l\}})|+a_n|\overline{x_l}-\overline{x_l}'|\\&+b_n\sum_{j\in\setminus[n]\{i,l\}}|\overline{y_{jl}}-\overline{y_{jl}}'|+b_n\delta\\&\leqslant 2a_n|\overline{x_l}-\overline{x_l}'|+(a_n+b_n)\sum_{j\in[n]\setminus\{i,l\}}|\overline{y_{jl}}-\overline{y_{jl}}'|+b_n\delta\end{aligned} \tag{27}$$

where $\overline{x_l}$ and $\overline{y_{jl}}$ are derived in (5) with $y_{i\setminus k}=y$ and $y_{ki}=\frac{1}{b_n}g(y_{i\setminus k})-\frac{a_n}{b_n}x_i-\sum_{j\in[n]\setminus\{k,i\}}y_{ji}$, according to Definition 4. Also, $\overline{x_l}'$ and $\overline{y_{jl}}'$ are derived similarly. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned}|\overline{x_l}-\overline{x_l}'|&\leqslant e_n\delta+e_n|y_{ki}-y'_{ki}|\\&\leqslant e_n(1+\frac{a_n}{b_n})\delta+\frac{e_n}{b_n}|g(y_{i\setminus k})-g(y'_{i\setminus k})|\\&\leqslant e_n(1+\frac{2a_n}{b_n})\delta,\end{aligned} \tag{28}$$

where in the last inequality we used the Lipschitz continuity of g. Similarly, we have

$$|\overline{y_{jl}} - \overline{y_{jl}}'| \leqslant e_n(1+\frac{2a_n}{b_n})\delta. \tag{29}$$

By combining (27), (28) and (29) we have

$$\begin{aligned} &b_n\tau\big|\mathcal{M}_{\epsilon,l}g(y_{i\backslash k}) - \mathcal{M}_{\epsilon,l}g(y'_{i\backslash k})\big| \\ &\leqslant \frac{1}{b_n}\big(e_n(na_n+(n-2)b_n)(b_n+2a_n)+b_n^2\big)\delta. \end{aligned} \tag{30}$$

This together with (26) imply that

$$\begin{aligned} &|\mathcal{T}g(y_{i\backslash k}) - \mathcal{T}g(y'_{i\backslash k})| \\ &\leqslant \frac{(n-1)\big(e_n(na_n+(n-2)b_n)(b_n+2a_n)+b_n^2\big)}{b_n^2\tau}\delta. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, a sufficient condition on $\mathcal{T}g$ for being Lipschitz continuous with parameter a_n is that

$$\frac{(n-1)\big(e_n(na_n+(n-2)b_n)(b_n+2a_n)+b_n^2\big)}{b_n^2\tau} \leqslant a_n.$$

which completes the proof. ∎

Suppose that the parameters of the system satisfy (24). First notice that since $\varphi(\alpha) \in [0,1]$, it follows that $\mathcal{T}g(y) \in [1,n]$ for all $y \in \mathbb{R}^{n-1}$. Therefore, one can view $\mathcal{T}$ as a mapping $\mathcal{T}: \mathcal{F}\cap C_0(\mathbb{R}^{n-1},[0,n]) \to \mathcal{F}\cap C_0(\mathbb{R}^{n-1},[1,n])$. The following lemma shows that indeed such a mapping is a contraction mapping for a set of parameters.

Lemma 8. *For any two functions $g, h \in \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{F})$,*

$$\|\mathcal{T}g_1 - \mathcal{T}g_2\| \leqslant \frac{(n-1)(e_n(na_n+(n-2)b_n)+b_n)}{b_n^2\tau}\|g_1-g_2\|.$$

Proof. For any $y \in \mathbb{R}^{n-1}$,

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathcal{T}g_1(y) - \mathcal{T}g_2(y) \\ &= \sum_{l\in[n]\backslash\{i\}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{n-1}} \big(\varphi(\mathcal{M}_{\epsilon,l}g_1(y)) - \varphi(\mathcal{M}_{\epsilon,l}g_2(y))\big) f_\epsilon(\epsilon)d\epsilon \\ &\leqslant \sum_{l\in[n]\backslash\{i\}} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{n-1}} |\mathcal{M}_{\epsilon,l}g_1(y)) - \mathcal{M}_{\epsilon,l}g_2(y)| f_\epsilon(\epsilon)d\epsilon \\ &\leqslant \sum_{l\in[n]\backslash\{i\}} \sup_{\epsilon\in\mathbb{R}^{n-1}} |\mathcal{M}_{\epsilon,l}g_1(y)) - \mathcal{M}_{\epsilon,l}g_2(y')|. \end{aligned} \tag{31}$$

For any $\epsilon \in \mathbb{R}^{n-1}$ and $l \in [n]\setminus\{i\}$, by definition of $\mathcal{M}_{\epsilon,l}g_1$ and $\mathcal{M}_{\epsilon,l}g_2$ in (19) and triangle inequality we have

$$\begin{aligned} &b_n\tau|\mathcal{M}_{\epsilon,l}g_1(y_{i\backslash k}) - (\mathcal{M}_{\epsilon,l}g_2(y_{i\backslash k})| \\ \leqslant &|g_1(\overline{x_l^1}+\varepsilon_l, \{\overline{y_{jl}^1}+\varepsilon_{jl}\}_{j\in[n]\backslash\{i,l\}}) \\ &- g_2(\overline{x_l^2}+\varepsilon_l, \{\overline{y_{jl}^2}+\varepsilon_{jl}\}_{j\in[n]\backslash\{i,l\}})| \\ &+ a_n|\overline{x_l^1} - \overline{x_l^2}| + b_n \sum_{j\in[n]\backslash\{i,l\}} |\overline{y_{jl}^1} - \overline{y_{jl}^2}|, \end{aligned} \tag{32}$$

where $\overline{x_l^m}$ and $\overline{y_{jl}^m}$, for $m=1,2$, are derived in (5) with $y_{i\backslash k} = y$ and $y_{ki} = \frac{1}{b_n}g_m(y_{i\backslash k}) - \frac{a_n}{b_n}x_i - \sum_{j\in[n]\backslash\{k,i\}} y_{ji}$, according to Definition 4. Note that, for $y, y' \in \mathbb{R}^{n-1}$,

$$\begin{aligned} |g_1(y) - g_2(y')| &\leqslant |g_1(y) - g_1(y')| + |g_1(y') - g_2(y')| \\ &\leqslant a_n\|y-y'\|_1 + \|g_1-g_2\|, \end{aligned} \tag{33}$$

where we used Lemma 7 for Lipschitz continuity of g_1 with parameter a_n and the triangle inequality. Using (33) in (32) we get

$$\begin{aligned} &b_n\tau|\mathcal{M}_{\epsilon,l}g_1(y_{i\backslash k}) - (\mathcal{M}_{\epsilon,l}g_2(y_{i\backslash k})| \\ &\leqslant 2a_n|\overline{x_l^1} - \overline{x_l^2}| + (a_n+b_n)\sum_{j\in[n]\backslash\{i,l\}} |\overline{y_{jl}^1} - \overline{y_{jl}^2}| + \|g_1-g_2\|. \end{aligned} \tag{34}$$

Also,

$$|\overline{x_l^1} - \overline{x_l^2}| \leqslant \frac{e_n}{b_n}|g_1(y_{i\backslash k}) - g_2(y_{i\backslash k})| \leqslant \frac{e_n}{b_n}\|g_1-g_2\|, \tag{35}$$

and similarly,

$$|\overline{y_{jl}^2} - \overline{y_{jl}^2}| \leqslant \frac{e_n}{b_n}\|g_1-g_2\|. \tag{36}$$

Therefore, (34), (35) and (36) together imply that

$$\begin{aligned} &b_n\tau|\mathcal{M}_{\epsilon,l}g_1(y_{i\backslash k}) - (\mathcal{M}_{\epsilon,l}g_2(y_{i\backslash k})| \\ &\leqslant (\frac{na_ne_n}{b_n} + (n-2)e_n + 1)\|g_1-g_2\|. \end{aligned}$$

This together with (31) imply that

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathcal{T}g_1(y) - \mathcal{T}g_2(y) \\ &\leqslant \frac{(n-1)(e_n(na_n+(n-2)b_n)+b_n)}{b_n^2\tau}\|g_1-g_2\|, \end{aligned}$$

which completes the proof of lemma. ∎

Both conditions on the parameters of the system derived in Lemma 7 and Lemma 8 are needed in order to establish that $\mathcal{T}$ is a contraction mapping over $\mathcal{F}$. Let

$$\begin{aligned} w_n = \max\Big\{&\frac{(n-1)(e_n(na_n+(n-2)b_n)+b_n)}{b_n^2}, \\ &\frac{(n-1)\big(e_n(na_n+(n-2)b_n)(b_n+2a_n)+b_n^2\big)}{a_nb_n^2}\Big\} \end{aligned} \tag{37}$$

If $w_n < \tau$, then the conditions of Lemma 7 and Lemma 8 are both satisfied which leads to the following theorem.

Theorem 9. *Let $w_n < \tau$. Then the sequence of functions $\{g^{(t)}\}$ defined by (21), where $g^{(0)} \in \mathcal{F}$, converges to a unique fixed point $g = \mathcal{T}g$ in the space $\mathcal{F}$ embedded with the $\mathcal{L}_\infty$ norm.*

Proof. Let $w_n < \tau$. Then by Lemma 8, $\mathcal{T}$ would be a contraction mapping over $\mathcal{F}$ with $\mathcal{L}_\infty$ norm (which is a complete space) and hence, the result follows immediately by the Banach Fixed Point Theorem [10]. ∎

The following theorem is the main result of this section.

Theorem 10. *If $w_n < \tau$, then there exists a continuous threshold function $h: \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}$ that leads to a threshold policy equilibrium. Furthermore, $h(y)$ can be numerically approximated with arbitrarily enough precision, with respect to $\mathcal{L}_\infty$ norm.*

Proof. The proof follows from Theorem 6, Lemma 7 and Theorem 9. The continuity of g (and hence, h) follows from the fact that if the above condition holds, then $\mathcal{T}$ would be a contraction mapping from $\mathcal{F}\cap C_0(\mathbb{R}^{n-1},[1,n])$ to itself and $\mathcal{F}\cap C_0(\mathbb{R}^{n-1},[1,n])$ is a closed subset of $C_0(\mathbb{R}^{n-1},[1,n])$. Therefore, the iterations converge to a function in $\mathcal{F}$ which is (Lipschitz) continuous. ∎





Figure 2. The iterative solution $g(x)$ for $\sigma^2 = 1$ and $\tau^2 = 9$.

Regarding the conditions on the noise variance parameters it should be noted that for a fixed ratio of $r = \frac{\tau}{\sigma}$, the parameters a_n, b_n, c_n, d_n, introduced in Lemma 4 and Lemma 5, e_n, defined in (23), and w_n, defined in (37), are all also fixed. Therefore, one can fix r while scaling τ and σ with a large enough constant c in order to have $w_n < \tau$. Roughly speaking, for a sufficiently noisy environment the condition of Theorem 10 holds.

Let Θ denote the set of all $(\sigma^2, \tau^2) \in \mathbb{R}^{+2}$ for which the threshold policy equilibrium exists. By Theorem 10, if $w_n < \tau$, a condition fully characterized by σ, τ and n, then $(\sigma^2, \tau^2) \in \Theta$. Therefore, Θ is an unbounded set, indeed in any direction, as discussed above. This completes the proof of Theorem 3.

V. NUMERICAL ANALYSIS

In this section, we consider the simple case of a global game with two agents, i.e., $n = 2$ for a numerical analysis. In this case, the independent noisy observations are x_1 and x_2. Furthermore, agent 1 observes $y_1 = x_2 + \zeta_{21}$ and agent 2 observes $y_2 = x_2 + \zeta_{12}$. In Theorem 2, we proved that there is a coordinated equilibrium strategy of the form

$$s = (1_{h(x_1,y_1)\geqslant 0}, 1_{h(x_2,y_2)\geqslant 0}),$$

for some continuous and strictly decreasing function $h : \mathbb{R}^2 \to \mathbb{R}$, under the condition provided in Theorem 10 which can be reformulated as

$$\frac{4a^2 + 3a - 1}{a(1-a)} \leqslant \tau,$$

where $a = a_2 = \frac{\sigma^2+\tau^2}{2\sigma^2+\tau^2}$. Furthermore, the convergence method presented in Section IV-C can be used to find $\mathcal{I}h : \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$h(x, y) = \mathcal{I}h(x) - y$$

is a fixed point threshold function.

For simplicity, the fixed point equation is solved for the function $g(x) = ax + b\mathcal{I}h(x) - 1$, which is slightly modified comparing to (17). In the simulations, we demonstrate the convergence of solution $g(x)$ of (21) after only eight iterations. This is shown for the numerical example of $\sigma^2 = 1$ and $\tau^2 = 9$ in Figure IV-C.

VI. CONCLUSION

In this paper, we studied global games with noisy sharing of information and the existence and the structure of equilibria for those games. We showed that under some conditions on the noise parameters of the system, there exists a unique threshold-type equilibrium policy. To show this, we formulated the existence of such an equilibrium as an existence of a solution to a functional fixed point equation. Using this, we showed that for a set of noise parameters, the fixed point equation results in a contraction mapping on certain complete spaces and hence, we obtain a unique equilibrium based on threshold policies. Furthermore, such a contraction mapping would also provide us with a natural approximation mechanism.

APPENDIX

Lemma 11. *Let θ be picked from the non-informative uniform prior on $\mathbb{R}$. Further, let $\{\phi_i\}_{i\in[n]}$ denote noisy observations of θ with additive zero-mean independent Gaussian noises with variances $\{\sigma_i^2\}_{i\in[n]}$. Let $\frac{1}{\sigma_\theta^2} := \sum_{i\in[n]} \frac{1}{\sigma_i^2}$. Then, conditioned on $\{\phi_i\}_{i\in[n]}$, we can write θ as follows.*

$$\theta = \sigma_\theta^2 \sum_{i\in[n]} \frac{\phi_i}{\sigma_i^2} + z,$$

where z is $\mathcal{N}(0, \sigma_\theta^2)$ which is independent of $\{\phi_i\}_{i\in[n]}$.

Proof. We have

$$f(\theta \mid \{\phi_i\}_{i\in[n]}) = \frac{f(\{\phi_i\}_{i\in[n]} \mid \theta)}{\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} f(\{\phi_i\}_{i\in[n]} \mid \alpha) d\alpha} = \frac{\exp\left(-\sum_{i\in[n]} \frac{(\phi_i-\theta)^2}{2\sigma_i^2}\right)}{\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \exp\left(-\sum_{i\in[n]} \frac{(\phi_i-\alpha)^2}{2\sigma_i^2}\right) d\alpha}. \quad (38)$$

By inspecting the PDF in (38), it is clear that θ is a Gaussian random variable conditioned on $\{\phi_i\}_{i\in[n]}$. It is therefore sufficient to calculate its mean and its variance, which lead to the desired result. ∎

REFERENCES

[1] H. Carlsson and E. van Damme, "Global games and equilibrium selection," *Econometrica*, vol. 61, pp. 989–1018, 1993.
[2] S. Morris and H. S. Shin, "Unique equilibrium in a model of self-fulfilling currency attacks," *American Economic Review*, vol. 88, p. 587=597, 1998.
[3] ——, "Global games: theory and applications," *Econometric Society Monographs*, vol. 35, pp. 56–114, 2003.

[4] M. Dahleh, A. Tahbaz-Salehi, J. Tsitsiklis1, and Z. S.I., "On global games in social networks of information exchange," technical report.
[5] A. Nayyar, A. Mahajan, and D. Teneketzis, "Optimal control strategies in delayed sharing information structures," *Automatic Control, IEEE Transactions on*, vol. 56, no. 7, pp. 1606–1620, 2011.
[6] A. Gupta, S. Yuksel, T. Basar, and C. Langbort, "On the existence of optimal policies for a class of static and sequential dynamic teams," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1404.1404*, 2014.
[7] A. Mahajan, N. Martins, M. Rotkowitz, and S. Yuksel, "Information structures in optimal decentralized control," in *Decision and Control (CDC), 2012 IEEE 51st Annual Conference on*, Dec 2012, pp. 1291–1306.
[8] J. Marden, "The role of information in multiagent coordination," in *Decision and Control (CDC), 2014 IEEE 53rd Annual Conference on*, Dec 2014, pp. 445–450.
[9] S. Morris, "Contagion," *Review of Economic Studies*, vol. 67, pp. 57–78, 2000.
[10] H. K. Khalil and J. Grizzle, *Nonlinear systems*. Prentice hall Upper Saddle River, 2002, vol. 3.